

Remarks/Arguments

Claim 1 has been cancelled and claim 17 has been substituted therefor.

Claims 3, 9, 17 and 18 are presented for consideration.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Farmer in view of Lee.

The rejection states that Farmer discloses a putter having a sole, a top, a back, a face, a bore in its top, a hosel having a foot with a projection to fit in the bore and an upper portion with a receptacle, a shaft having a first end to fit into a hosel and a second end supporting a grip, a head formed of a first material and a hosel formed of a second material and a receptacle arranged at a selected angle to the axis of the body.

The rejection states Farmer lacks a hosel formed of a square with a foot having a polygonal shaped outwardly flared should having vertical sides of about 2 mm and a head with a polygonal shaped recess with vertical side walls of about 2 mm in height formed about a bore.

The rejection then states that Lee discloses a putter with a hosel formed with a square body, a shoulder with vertical sides located above a projection, a head with a recess having vertical sides formed about a bore. Also, it is stated that "a shoulder secured in a recess with sides engaged with the walls forming a non-rotating engagement" is also taught by Lee. It is noted that Lee does not disclose a shoulder nor the height of the sides of the shoulder inserted into the recess. The rejection is that it would be obvious to modify Farmer to have a square hosel with a foot having a shoulder with vertical sides located above a projection with a head having a recess 2

mm in height formed about a bore with the shoulder secured in the recess with its sides engaged with the walls forming a non-rotating engagement. Further, it is stated that in view of Lee it would be obvious to provide an outwardly flared shoulder with vertical sides 2mm in height to mate with the 2 mm vertical walls of the recess.

Claim 8 is also rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Farmer, in view of Lee and further in view of Delio.

Delio is said to show in Figure 2 a hosel having a length about equal the diameter of a golf ball which is said to be 1.7 inches. To then provide the hosel of Farmer be between 1-3 inches would be obvious.

The reference to Farmer teaches much of the claimed structure of the instant putter as stated including providing an assortment of components including a head, a hosel and a shaft. The head top is provided with a bore to receive the end of the hosel. The reference to Farmer fails to teach a hosel having a rectangular shaped body of 1-3" with a foot having an outwardly flared polygonal shaped shoulder with vertical sides of about 2 mm. The reference does not teach a polygonal shaped recess formed in the putter head with a bottom and vertical walls of about 2 mm formed about the bottom and a bore formed in the bottom. The reference does not teach positioning the projecting end of the hosel into the bore with the side walls of the outward flared shoulder in engagement with the vertical walls of the recess locking the hosel against rotation relative the putter head. The reference does not teach a flared portion of the hosel merging with the top of the putter head. The reference Farmer does not teach forming the putter head of one material and the hosel of another and different material. The reference teaches only of forming the putter head of one material and the hosel of one

material, both the same material.

The reference Lee is directed to a multi-component putter with a putter head including a main body 3 formed of metal and coated with a resilient plastic sheath 4 of no particular thickness. As best shown in Figure 4 and described in paragraph 17, the sheath 4 is cut to form a rectangular hole 421. A bore 323 is located in the top of the main body 3 of the club head within rectangular hole 421. Bore 323 receives extension 711 of club shaft 7. Shaft 7 includes lower section 71 which includes end extension 711. Extension 711 is inserted into hole 323 through hole 421 in sheath 4.

Lee makes no mention of the sides of section 71, which are shown recessed inward from the periphery of tubular end 712, engaging with the walls defining hole 421, which walls are formed of resilient plastic. No disclosure states that the combination structure of hole 421, the side walls of section 71, extension 711 and hole 323 provide a secure engagement between the hosel and the club head. Specifically, no mention is made that the resilient plastic forming the walls of hole 421 engages with and locks the hosel against rotation relative to the putter head. No mention is made of the depth of hole 421, but obviously it is restricted to the thickness of resilient plastic 4 which also is not disclosed. There is no flared shoulder formed on the hosel, and therefore, no flared shoulder merges with the top of the putter head. There is no matching of the hole depth with a shoulder height as there is no shoulder.

The reference to Figure 1 of Lee as showing a flared hosel bore is neither supported by the drawings nor the specification. The hosel is not referenced in the disclosure, only the structure of head 11. No flared hosel is shown nor described. Clearly, there is no motivation to alter Figure 4 as suggested by the Examiner.

Delio discloses no more than a drawing showing a representation of a putter head to include a hosel and the outline of a purported golf ball.

As is required by 37 CFR 111, the claim language which defines the claimed invention and is not taught by the applied prior art is now referred to.

The claim calls for a custom putter to include a putter head formed of a first material and which includes a sole, a top, a back and a face. The claim further calls for a hosel formed of a second and different material. No reference of the rejection teaches this structure, not Farmer, not Lee and not Delio.

The claim calls for a 2mm recess to be formed about a bore in the putter head. No reference of the rejection teaches this structure. Not Lee, which forms the recess in a resilient sheath 4 which covers the club head. (See ¶ 3.) Further, Lee fails to disclose the depth or thickness of resilient sheath 4.

The claim calls for a hosel having a rectangular shaped body of between 1 and 3 inches in length having a foot portion including an outwardly flared polygonal shaped shoulder with vertical sides of about 2 mm. No reference of the rejection discloses this structure and particularly not Lee. As earlier stated, Lee teaches an inwardly directed, as opposed to outwardly directed, section 71 having projection 711 inserted into holes 421 and 323. Section 71 is considerably longer than the depth of hole 421, and therefore, does not include a shoulder which merges with the top of the head or with the resilient coating.

The claim calls for the projection of the foot to be secured within the bore with the outwardly flared shoulder fitted into the recess with its vertical sides engaged with the vertical walls of the recess and upper portions of said flared shoulder merged with said

top of said putter head locking said hosel and putter head against relative rotation.

No reference of the rejection discloses this structure. Particularly not Lee which discloses no outwardly flared shoulder, no hole in the putter head but only a hole 421 of no particular depth formed in resilient coating 4. Resilient material 4 is not intended to lock nor does it lock the hosel against rotation relative the putter head. Further section 71 does not merge with the putter head top but rather terminates near tubular end 712.

For these reasons, it is believed that claim 17 as here presented clearly defines over the prior art of the rejection.

Claims 3, 9 and 18 depend from claim 17 and are believed to also be allowable.

It is respectfully urged that upon reconsideration, the Examiner find the claims to be allowable and the case passed to issue in the due course of PTO business.

Should the Examiner find the claims to be not allowable, it is requested that a telephone interview be initiated so that any outstanding issues may be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry S. Jaudon
Registration No. 34,056
McNair Law Firm, P.A.
P.O. Box 10827
Greenville, SC 29603-0827
Telephone: (864) 232-4261
Agent for the Applicant